श्री भगतराम मनहर : छत्तीसगढ़ में। इसीलिए तो 6 कीजिए। छत्तीसगढ़ नाम है।

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Madam, I move:

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Salim. In spite of your 'no', I knew you meant 'yes'.

श्री मोहम्मद सलीम : मैंने कहा कि 36 का एक आंकड़ा होता है। लेकिन छत्तीसगढ़ में एक जगह यह कैंसिल हो गया है।

श्री सुरेश पचौरी : मैडम, आज 9 अगस्त है, क्रांति दिवस है। इसलिए यह शुभ दिन है। इस नाते हमने यह बहुत शुभ कार्य किया है।

श्री संघ प्रिय गौतम : महोदया, छत्तीसगढ़ वालों को सदन की ओर से बधाई।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Statement of the Home Minister. Before you make it, Mr. Advani, I should make one announcement. This statement, as I said before, is coming on the request of the Leader of the Opposition and Mr. Mukherjee to the effect that as the situation changes in Kashmir, the Home Minister should come and apprise the House about it. So, there would be no clarification. This was the commitment. Members who have given their names for clarification, perhaps, do not know this commitment. I am not going to entertain them. The Home Minister can make the statement.

STATEMENT BY MINISTER

Situation in Jammu and Kashmir

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI L.K. ADVANI): Madam, on July 24, 2000, the Hizbul Mujahideen announced a unilateral cease-fire and publicly expressed a willingness to initiate talks with the Government of India. The Government of India responded positively to the offer.

The people of Jammu and Kashmir enthusiastically welcomed the development.

Yesterday's announcement by Hizbul Mujahideen that the cease-fire has been withdrawn, has naturally come as a deep disappointment to all those who were looking forward to a return of peace to the Jammu and Kashmir State.

The nature, location, context and content of the announcement by Hizbul Mujahideen leader, Syed Salahuddin, can leave no doubt in anybody's mind that it is Pakistan which has sabotaged the prospects of peace in the State.

The offer of cease-fire was made by Majid Dar, a leader of Hizbul Mujahideen, in Srinagar. It was withdrawn by Salahuddin in Islamabad.

It is clear that the voice that made the announcement may have been Salahuddin's, but the words came from the ruling establishment in Islamabad which is the arch patron for numerous militant groups engaged in State-sponsored cross-border terrorism in J and K and other parts of India.

The Hizbul Mujahideen leader has said that his organization withdrew from the proposed talks because of India's unwillingness to invite Pakistan as the third participant in the talks. This has precisely been the demand of Pakistan's military establishment, which it has expressed on several occasions in the past, but most shrilly, after Hizbul Mujahideen announced its cease-fire and its readiness to have talks with the Government of India.

Indeed, all statements from Islamabad since July 24 made it obvious that the cease-fire did not fit in with Pakistan's design of continuously promoting terrorism in J and K.

Pakistan's determination to sabotage the talks became known with deadly clarity when extremists trained and armed on its soil, created a mayhem of massacres in J and K on August 1 and 2, leaving over 100 innocent persons dead.

It is not difficult to know why Pakistan struck terror on such an unprecedented scale, and soon thereafter, sabotaged our initiative for talks with some representatives of our own people. The rulers of Pakistan are terrorized by the prospect of peace in J and K. They were similarly terrorized by the prospect of friendship with India following Prime Minister Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee's historic peace initiative in Lahore.

Kargil War was the result of their fear of peace in 1999. The brutal killing of the Amarnath Yatris and other innocent people is the result of their fear of peace in 2000.

Just as India could not be frightened by the War inflicted by Pakistan in Kargil, we shall not be frightened by the intensification of proxy war by Islamabad now. Pakistan had to face a humiliating and self-damaging defeat in the Kargil war. Similar will be its fate in its proxy war against India. India's sincere desire for restoration of peace and normalcy in J and K and a comprehensive and lasting solution to the issue of Kashmir are now clearly established.

Not only the people of Kashmir but also people all over the world now clearly know who is for peace and who is for hostilities; whose is the voice of sanity and humanity and whose is a voice of subterfuge and sabotage.

The hon. Members of this House must also have noticed the negative role played by the Hurriyat leadership in this entire episode. From the beginning, their response to the Hizbul initiative was not just cold, they even labelled it as a 'hasty' move. Perhaps, they forgot that Jammu and Kashmir has been in a bloodied turmoil for the last more than a decade. Under the circumstances, how could this peace initiative be called 'hasty'? It seems that the Hurriyat leadership was acting under pressure from Pakistan. They certainly did not act in the interest of Jammu and Kashmir and thus compromised the well-being of the people of the State.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House now stands adjourned till 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at fifty-one minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Thursday, the 10th August, 2000.

MGIPRRND—124 RSS/2001—300